

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DIANN SMITH,

Appellant,

V.

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION
SERVICES.

Respondent.

Respondent.

Case No. ALLO-00-0011

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on January 30, 2001, to hear Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated April 13, 2000. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, reviewed the file, exhibits and the recorded proceedings and participated in the decision in this matter. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. As a result of the ongoing Administrative Assistant Class study, the Department of Information Services conducted a review of all administrative assistant positions within the agency to determine whether the positions were properly allocated. Appellant's position was one of the positions reviewed. The Administrative Assistant Class study has not been finalized and revised classifications have not been adopted by the Personnel Resources Board.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Appearances. Appellant Diann Smith was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Information Services was represented by Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

1
2 By letter dated October 18, 1999, Nancy Widders, Human Resource Consultant, informed
3 Appellant that her position as an Administrative Assistant 2 was being reallocated down to the class
4 of Office Assistant Senior. By letter dated November 16, 1999, Appellant appealed this
5 determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On March 30, 2000, Paul Peterson,
6 Personnel Hearings Officer, conducted an allocation review and by letter dated April 13, 2000, he
7 informed Appellant that her position was properly allocated to the class of Office Assistant Senior.
8 On May 10, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the determination of the Department of Personnel
9 with the Personnel Appeals Board.

10
11 Appellant works in the Telecommunication Services Division where she provides clerical support
12 and assists in preparing, editing and proofreading material for the SCAN Directory using a desk top
13 publishing software program. Appellant creates, updates, organizes, files and retrieves SCAN
14 related account detail information; prepares the directory for final approval and distribution; and
15 works on other SCAN related or 911 projects as necessary.

16
17 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant does not dispute that her position no longer
18 provides administrative support responsibilities nor does she argue that Respondent improperly
19 allocated her position to the class of Office Assistant Senior. However, Appellant argues that the
20 agency should have waited until the Administrative Assistant Class study was completed and
21 finalized before reallocating her downward. Appellant argues that her reallocation downward was
22 premature, that Respondent should have waited to see if her duties fit any of the classes resulting
23 from the Administrative Assistant study and that she was demoted because Respondent failed to
24 review her position three years ago, when her duties changed. Appellant also asserted that the
25 Publications Specialist classification more closely addresses her duties.

1 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that as a result of the ongoing class
2 study, it conducted a desk audit of Appellant's position which showed that Appellant's duties were
3 no longer at the Administrative Assistant level. Respondent argues that Appellant's primary
4 responsibility is to maintain and update the SCAN directories utilizing Ventura, a specialized
5 database program. Respondent argues that based on the duties performed by Appellant, her position
6 is best described by the Office Assistant Senior classification.

7
8 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
9 to the Office Assistant Senior classification should be affirmed.

10
11 **Relevant Classifications.** Administrative Assistant 2 (class code 09530) and Office Assistant
12 Senior (class code 01011).

13
14 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
15 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
16 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
17 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
18 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
19 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
20 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
21 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

22
23 Appellant does not dispute that she is properly allocated to the Office Assistant Senior
24 classification. Her primary objection, however, is the timing of her position review in light of the
25 Administrative Assistant class study. The timing of an allocation review is not a factor considered
26 by the Board in determining the proper allocation of a position. Although Appellant asserted that

1 the Publications Specialist classification describes her current duties, she failed to provide specific
2 exceptions to the director's determination and she failed to address the duties and responsibilities of
3 her position in comparison to the Publications Specialist classification. WAC 358-30-170 provides
4 that in hearings on allocation appeals, appellants have the burden of proof. Appellant failed to meet
5 her burden of proof.

6
7 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
8 determination dated April 13, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

9
10 **ORDER**

11 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Diann Smith is
12 denied and the Director's determination dated April 13, 2000, is affirmed and adopted.

13
14 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

15
16 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

17
18 _____
19 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

20
21 _____
22 Leana D. Lamb, Member

23
24
25
26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504